

**IN THE UNITED STATES' DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
MAR 30 2 10 PM '04

CIVIL ACTION:

04-CV-10192-WGY

AZUBUKO -
Plaintiff

vs.

BOARD OF BAR OVERSEERS OF THE
SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT -

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR JUDGE YOUNG'S SELF-DISQUALIFICATION/RECUSAL

These would be the bases for the head:

01) Reiteratively and in all modesty, the Plaintiff needed no handholding in the legal or judicial kingdom. In essence, the Plaintiff could think critically and creatively autonomously. Glory, the administration of justice charade of March 16th, 2004 was historical. It was reminiscent of man being agent of changes negatively and positively. Well, there would be no cataclysms without catalysts.

02) The Plaintiff knew that Judge Young should not preside over the case. The Plaintiff thought that with time and age, the leopard would change its colors. The Plaintiff was deadly wrong like the Intelligent Analysts of the Iraqi's Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) or Weapons of Mass Disappearance (WMD). The Plaintiff expected Saul-Jonathan saga to prevail. The Plaintiff was substantially wrong too. Again, leopards never changed their colors.

03) Central to the insidious and invidious states of things, the Plaintiff considered the head inevitable. The Plaintiff was not the father of resusal. [28 USC Section 455] At the United States Supreme Court, recusal had been a common knowledge these days. Justice Scalia was urged not to participate on his friend - Vice President Cheney - involvement on Bush's administration energy policy. On the self-

same newspaper, it was entitled, thus: "13 in GOP urged Ginsburg recusal." [The Boston Globe of Friday – March 19th 2004, pp. 2 and 9]

04) Judge Young thought that he would originate *LEGAL IMPOSSIBILITIES* and expected the Plaintiff to internalize them sheepishly. The Ayatollahistic approach to administration of justice was insidious and invidious. His plans of containing the Plaintiff via intimidation with brims and stones was diametrically unconstitutional hence the delay in the formulation of his threatening decisions. Were Judges not civil servants or self-employed business moguls?

05) Judge Young was a Judge and not an Attorney for the Defendant. The Defendant was expert in legal deceptions. For example, most of the precedents the Defendant cited were in favor of the Plaintiff. Without digressing, the case was not filed under "*In Forma Pauperis*" as the Defendant stated. Importantly, Judge Young had no authority to be the Plaintiff's Speaking Agent devoid of modicum of authorization. He thought that the Defendant had judicial absolute immunity over the gist for the proceedings. The Plaintiff strongly disagreed with the palpable propensity for depersonalization of the Plaintiff. Indeed, nobody had monopoly to legal wisdom or critical and creative thinking. [*Supreme Court of Virginia, et al. v. Consumers Union of the United States, Inc., et al.* 446 U.S. 719 (1980), appealed from the United States' District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, (No. 79-198); *Schuer, Administratrix v. Rhodes*, 316 U.S. 232 (1974) and appealed from the United States' Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (No. 72-914)]

CONCLUSION

"S/he who walks gingerly will not hurt her/him self." On more scores than one, Judge Young should certainly recuse himself from the case as the Plaintiff effusively prayed. His mindset against the Plaintiff would deprive the Plaintiff Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses. They were not the least constitutional doctrines in the United States' Constitution. More, Judge Young lacked jurisdiction over the case! The failure to retransfer the case to Macon represented deprivation of "Due Process" and "Liberty of Contracts." Hopefully, the Court should not be the one, who smiled at the funerals. With

candor in communications, despotic and Ayatollahistic acts qualified for *unconstitutionality*. Repetitively, the case should be re-transferred expeditiously and the Defendant had no immunity on knowingly "*failure to enforce the law.*"


Respectfully submitted on Monday – March 29th - 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chukwuma E. Azubuko', written over a horizontal line.

CHUKWUMA E. AZUBUKO,
Pro Se,
P. O. Box 1351,
Boston – MA 02117-1351.
Telephone # (617) 522 9163.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The Plaintiff/undersigned under the penalties for perjury certified that a true copy of the head was served upon the Assistant Attorneys of record for the Defendant – Ernest L. Sarason, Jr. and Sarah Joss - at The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Office of the Attorney General, 200 Portland Street, Boston, MA 02114 by the United States' pre-paid first-class mail on Monday – March 29th – 2004.



CHUKWUMA E. AZUBUKO,
Pro Se.